

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

JESSIHA LANCASTER,

Plaintiff,

v.

HAROLD CLARK, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. C07-5251 RJB/KLS

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION TO COMPEL  
ANSWERS TO  
INTERROGATORIES

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion to Order Defendants to Answer Interrogatories. (Dkt. # 85). Having reviewed the motion, Defendants' response (Dkt. # 88), and balance of the record, the Court finds that the motion should be denied.

Plaintiff does not indicate he has met and conferred with opposing counsel prior to filing this motion as required by Local Rule 37 (a)(2). A party applying to the Court for an order compelling discovery "must include a certification that he has in good faith conferred or attempted to confer with the person or party failing to make the discovery in an effort to secure the information or material without court intervention." Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(2)(B). In addition, "[a] good faith effort to confer with a party or person not making a disclosure or discovery requires a face-to-face meeting or a telephonic conference." Local Rule CR 37(a)(2)(A). The Court expects all parties to cooperate in their discovery efforts.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED:**

- (1) Plaintiff's motion to order Defendants to answer interrogatories (Dkt. # 85) is **DENIED without prejudice**; and
- (2) The Clerk of the Court shall send copies of this Order to the Plaintiff and counsel for Defendants.

DATED this 4th day of December, 2007.

  
Karen L. Strombom  
United States Magistrate Judge